REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on 31 March 2009 was received and reviewed. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A) Applicable Authority

Title 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) declares, a patent shall not issue when "the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains." The Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere* counseled that an obviousness determination is made by identifying: the scope and content of the prior art; the level of ordinary skill in the prior art; the differences between the claimed invention and prior art references; and secondary considerations. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966). To support a finding of obviousness, the initial burden is on the Office to apply the framework outlined in *Graham* and to provide some reason, or suggestions or motivations found either in the prior art references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to produce the claimed invention. See *Application of Bergel,* 292 F.2d 955, 956-957 (CCPA 1961). Recently, the Supreme Court elaborated, at pages 13-14 of the *KSR* opinion, it will be necessary for [the Office] to look at interrelated teachings of multiple [prior art references]; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by [one of] ordinary skill in the art, all in

order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the [patent application]." *KSR v. Teleflex*, No. 04-1350, 550 U.S. 398 (2007).

The following is a listing of the "prior art" printed subject matter relied on by the Office to maintain a 103 rejection of the pending claims.

1. David Morgenstern, *Under the Desktop: Prospecting for Quartz in Mac OS X*, pp. 1-4, Aug. 22, 2002 ("Morgenstern");

2. Apple, *Apple Introduces Jaguar, the Next Major Release of Mac OS X,* pp. 1-3,. Jul. 17, 2002 ("Apple");

3. Moki, *Aqua help in Nvidia GeoForce 4,* AppleInsider Web Archive, p. 1, Jan. 28, 2002 ("Moki");

4. John Siracusa, *MAC OS X 10.2*, Arstehnica Website, pp. 1-5, Sept. 5, 2002 ("Siracusa");

5. Shawn Erickson, *ScreenShot*, OmniGroup Website, p. 1, Jul. 30, 2002 ("Erickson");

6. Torrey Lyons, *Re*: *MacOS X*, Xfree86 Website, p. 1, Jul. 9, 2003 ("Lyons");

7. Roussel, *Ametista: a mini-toolkit for exploring new window management techniques*, p. 1, Aug. 2003 ("Roussel");

8. Portuesi, *Displaying In-Memory Video Using OpenGL*, Lukertech Website, p. 1, Oct. 16, 2002 ("Portuesi");

9. Lindberg, *2D Graphics Using Quartz*, OOPS Website, p. 1, May 22, 2001. ("Lindberg");

10. Lipton, *QuickDraw GX for Postscript Programmers*, Mactech Website, p. 1, Aug. 19, 2000 ("Lipton");

11. Apple Computers, About the Mac OS X Printing System, p. 1, Dec. 11, 2002 ("Apple Computers");

12. Solazzi, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0107570 ("Solazzi");

13. Mike Whitman, Technology Terminology Webpage from Web Archive ("Whitman");

14. Fowler, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0180741 ("Fowler");

15. Ben-Shachar., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0189599 ("Ben-Shachar");

16. Donham, U.S. Patent No. 6,980,209 ("Donham"");

17. Meagher, U.S. Patent No. 4,694,404 ("Meagher"); and

18. Farrah, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0030997 ("Farrah").

B) Obviousness Rejections Based on Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki.

Claims 1, 19, 21, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki, fail to describe or suggest, among other things, *receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in windows corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation; switching between the CDWM and the DWM to render the advanced application content and legacy application content;* as recited in independent claim 1. The Office relies upon Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki to render the invention of claim 1 unpatentable.

Morgenstern describes a rendering engine that uses layers and pdf primitives to generate screen graphics that are viewed by a user. Morgenstern, at page 3, further describes a rendering component that accesses everything as a pdf. Nothing in Morgenstern describes or suggests interfacing with legacy application content.

Portuesi describes converting between top-to-bottom and bottom-to-top. Portuesi fails to describe or suggest legacy application that is received in the top-to-bottom order is rendered in the top-to-bottom order in a legacy application window.

Apple Computers describes a print system for printing documents to a printer. Apple Computers describes configuring the page layout of a document to be left-right then top-bottom. Apple Computers fails to describe or suggest rendering windows associated with legacy applications and advanced applications in a graphical user interface.

Lipton describes a legacy API. Lipton does not describe receiving legacy application content and rendering that content. At best, Lipton describes a y-axis orientation for the legacy API. Lipton fails to describe or suggest receiving the legacy application content in top-to-bottom order.

Lyons describes the interaction between various rendering applications when executing an application. Lyons fails to describe rendering windows associated with legacy applications and advanced applications in a graphical user interface.

Moki describes the rendering engine for Apple and the effects that the rendering engine can generate. However, nothing in Moki describes a rendering engine capable of interface with both legacy applications and advanced applications simultaneously.

Erickson describes a hypothetical situation, posited by Dietmar Planitzer, having two windows: one for pictures and one for text. The hypothetical is then corrected by Jack

Shedd, who notes that the Core Graphics is Quartz 2d. Erickson fails to describe or suggest stripping out application content from the received legacy window content.

Moreover, Erickson appears to conflict with Lyons and Apple Computers. In Lyons, at pg. 1, it appears Cocca uses the AppKit not Quartz 2d. Moreover, in Apple Computers, at pg. 25, it appears Cocca uses Coca drawing routines, which are separate from Quartz 2d. These inconsistencies suggest that the references do not refer to the same version of the operating system. Accordingly, it is improper to use these references to support the obviousness rejection because they do not refer to the same release or product.

Unlike Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki, alone or in combination, the invention of independent claim 1 requires, among other things, receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in windows corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation; and switching between the CDWM and the DWM to render the advanced application content and legacy application content. Jaguar fails to expressly or inherently describe or suggest all elements of the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 1.

Dependent claim 19 further defines novel features of the invention of independent claim 1 and depends directly from independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, dependent claim 19 is believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of its dependency. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). As such,

withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claim 19 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 21 is computer storage configured to perform a method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A compositing desktop window manager (CDWM) receives application content from advanced applications in a bottom-to-top order to display the application content received in a bottom-to-top order in windows corresponding to the advanced applications in the graphical user interface. A desktop window manager (DWM) receives application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in windows corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface. Application content received from the legacy applications are stripped and converted to a graphical representation. The DWM redirects received application content to the CDWM, which renders the advanced application content and legacy application content and displays at least a portion of the application content in an opaque content portion of the windows, where the windows have a translucent frame portion.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki, fails to describe or suggest, among other things, *receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in windows corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface, wherein the DWM redirects the application content received to the CDWM; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation;* as recited in independent claim 21.

The Office relies upon Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki to render the invention of independent claim 21 unpatentable. The cited portions describe or suggest a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. As discussed above, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki fail to describe or suggest the DWM to the CDWM that render the graphical user interface. Nothing in Morgenstern describes or suggests interfacing with legacy application content. Portuesi fails to describe or suggest legacy application that is received in the top-to-bottom order is rendered in the top-to-bottom order in a legacy application window. Apple Computers fails to describe or suggest rendering windows in a graphical user interface. Lipton fails to describe or suggest receiving the legacy application content in top-to-bottom order. Erickson fails to describe or suggest stripping out application content from the received legacy window content. Alone or in combination, nothing in Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki, describes or suggests, among other things, redirecting application content from the DWM to the CDWM to render content in a graphical user interface.

Unlike Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki, the invention of independent claim 21 requires, among other things, receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in windows corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface, wherein the DWM redirects the application content received to the CDWM; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation. Jaguar fails to expressly or inherently describe or suggest all elements of the invention of independent

claim 21. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 21.

Dependent claim 39 further defines novel features of the invention of independent claim 21 and depends directly from independent claim 21. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 21, dependent claim 39 is believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of its dependency. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claim 39 are respectfully requested.

C) Obviousness Rejections Based on Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, and further in view of Siracusa.

Claims 7-11, 15-16, 27-31, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, and further in view of Siracusa. At paragraph 29, claim 44 is mentioned in the header of the rejection but no rejection of claim 44 is made under these references. Because the Office failed to address claim 44 under this rejection, Applicant does not comment on the applicability of the this rejection to claim 44. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Dependent claims 7-11 and 15-16 further define novel features of the invention of independent claim 1 and each depend directly, or indirectly, from independent claim 1. Claims 7-11 and 15-16 are allowable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claim 1. Siracusa fails to remedy the deficiencies of Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, dependent claims 7-11, 15-16, and 19 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue

of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claims 7-11, 15-16, and 19 are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 27-31 further define novel features of the invention of independent claim 21 and each depend directly, or indirectly, from independent claim 21. Claims 27-31 are allowable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claim 21. Siracusa fails to remedy the deficiencies of Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 21, dependent claims 27-31 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claims 27-31 are respectfully requested.

D) Obviousness Rejections Based on Erickson, in view of Lyons and further in view of Siracusa.

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erickson, in view of Lyons and further in view of Siracusa. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Independent claim 44 is a computer operating system that uses a composited desktop rendering model that provides legacy support for applications compatible only with an invalidation desktop rendering model. An instance of a legacy application program providing legacy window information to a legacy desktop window manager (DWM). In turn, client content is stripped from the legacy window information and converted to a raster image. The compositing desktop window manager (CDWM) draws a window to a buffer memory, wherein

the CDWM renders the window by applying a texture to a mesh that comprises the raster image of the client content and default non-client information.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Erickson, in view of Lyons and further in view of Siracusa, fails to describe or suggest, among other things, *providing legacy window information from an instance of a legacy application program to a legacy desktop window manager (DWM) executing on the computer; stripping out client content from the legacy window information; converting the client content to a raster image of the client content; . . . applying a texture to a mesh, and wherein the texture comprises the raster image of the client content and default non-client information;* as recited in independent claim 44. The Office relies upon Erickson, in view of Lyons and further in view of Siracusa to render the invention of independent claim 44 unpatentable. The cited portions describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment.

As discussed above, the references relied on by the Office do not provide a coherent and consistent description of Jaguar. Furthermore, the references fail to describe converting legacy application content to a raster image that is used to texture a mesh created by a compositing window manager. Erickson describes a hypothetical situation, posited by Dietmar Planitzer, having two windows: one for pictures and one for text. The hypothetical is then corrected by Jack Shedd, who notes that the Core Graphics is Quartz 2d. Erickson fails to describe or suggest stripping out application content from the received legacy window content. Lyons describes rendering application content using Apple APIs. Siracusa explains that Quartz Extreme may free up CPU cycles on the processor. However, Erickson, Lyons and Siracusa fail to describe or suggest rendering legacy application content as the texture of a mesh. Additionally, Erickson, Lyons and Siracusa fail to describe or suggest the default non-client

information that is included in the texture. Nothing in Erickson, Lyons and Siracusa describes or suggests, among other things, the interaction between a legacy DWM and CDWM to render content in a graphical user interface.

Unlike Erickson, Lyons and Siracusa, the invention of independent claim 44 requires, among other things, providing legacy window information from an instance of a legacy application program to a legacy desktop window manager (DWM) executing on the computer; stripping out client content from the legacy window information; converting the client content to a raster image of the client content. Erickson, Lyons and Siracusa fails to expressly or inherently describe or suggest all elements of the invention independent claim 44. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 44.

E) Obviousness Rejections Based on Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons, Moki,. and Solazzi.

Claims 18 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, and further in view of Solazzi. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Claims 18 and 38 depend from independent claims 1 and 21, respectively. As discussed above, Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki fails to describe or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 18 and 38 are patentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Solazzi fails to cure the deficiencies of Jaguar with respect to the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. As such,

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claims 18 and 38.

F) Obviousness Rejections Based on Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, in view of Solazzi, and further in view of Whitman .

Claims 17 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, in view of Solazzi, and further in view of Whitman (Technology Terminology, Mike Whitman, May 13, 2001). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Claims 17 and 37 depend from independent claims 1 and 21. As discussed above, Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki fail to describe or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 17 and 37 are patentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Solazzi and Whitman fail to cure the deficiencies of Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki with respect to the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claims 17 and 37.

G) Obviousness Rejections Based on Morgenstern, in view of Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of Whitman, and further in view of Fowler.

Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern and Moki in view of Solazzi, Whitman, and Fowler. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Independent claim 41 is a computer implemented method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A compositing desktop

window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. Application content to display in a window is received; and at least a portion of the application content is displayed in a content portion of the window having a frame portion, where displaying further comprises rendering spectral highlights on the frame portion based on a virtual light source by the compositing desktop window manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Morgenstern and Moki in view of Solazzi, Whitman, and Fowler, fail to describe or suggest, among other things, *receiving application content to display in a window; . . . the compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping*, as recited in independent claim 41. The Office relies upon Morgenstern and Moki in view of Solazzi, Whitman, and Fowler to render the invention of claim 41 unpatentable.

Morgenstern, at page 3, further describes a rendering component that accesses everything as a pdf. Nothing in Morgenstern describes or suggests environmental windowing effects. Moki describes the rendering engine for Apple and the effects that the rendering engine can generate. However, nothing in Moki describes a rendering engine capable of providing environmental mappings. The cited portions of Solazzi describe reflective properties of 3-D images. The cited portions of Whitman provides term definitions. The cited portion of Fowler describes bump maps for images. However, Fowler fails to describe or suggest a windows manager that provides bump mappings and environmental mappings. Nothing in Morgenstern and Moki, Solazzi, Whitman, or Fowler, alone and in combination, describes or suggests, among other things, receiving application content in a window and a CDWM for providing transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping.

Unlike Moki , Solazzi, Whitman, or Fowler, the invention of independent claim 41 requires, among other things, receiving application content and a compositing desktop window manager that is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping for windows that display the application content. Moki , Solazzi, Whitman, or Fowler, alone and in combination, fail to expressly or inherently describe or suggest all elements of the invention of independent claim 41. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 41.

H) Obviousness Rejections Based on Morgenstern, Portuesi and Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of Whitman, in view of Fowler, and further in view of Ben-Shachar.

Claim 43 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi and Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of Whitman, in view of Fowler, and further in view of Ben-Shachar. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Independent claim 43 is a computer implemented method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A compositing desktop window manager receives application content in reverse z-order to display in a window. The compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. At least a portion of the application content is displayed in a content portion of the window having a frame portion, where displaying further comprises rendering refractive content on the frame portion based on other discrete content behind the window in the graphical user interface by the compositing desktop window manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Morgenstern, Portuesi and Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of Whitman, in view of Fowler, and further in view of Ben-Shachar, fails to describe or suggest, among other things, *receiving, at a compositing desktop window manager, application content in reverse z-order to display in a window; . . . the compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping*, as recited in independent claim 43.

The Office relies upon Morgenstern, Portuesi and Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of Whitman, in view of Fowler, and further in view of Ben-Shachar to render the invention of independent claim 43 unpatentable. Morgenstern, Portuesi and Moki describes some window transparency but fail to describe or suggest environmental mapping. As discussed above, Fowler fails to describe or suggest a windows manager that provides bump mappings and environmental mappings. Moreover, Ben-Schachar fails to describe or suggest a compositing desktop window manager that receives application content in reverse z-order. Nothing in Morgenstern, Portuesi Moki, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, or Ben-Shachar, alone and in combination, describes, or suggests, among other things, receiving application content in reverse z-order to display in a window and a CDWM for providing transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping.

Unlike Morgenstern, Portuesi and Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of Whitman, in view of Fowler, and further in view of Ben-Shachar, the invention of independent claim 43 requires, among other things, receiving application content in reverse z-order to display in a window at a compositing desktop window manager that is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. Morgenstern, Portuesi

and Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of Whitman, in view of Fowler, and further in view of Ben-Shachar, alone and in combination, fail to expressly or inherently describe or suggest all elements of the invention of independent claim 43. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 43.

I) Obviousness Rejections Based on Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computer, Lipton, Lyons, and Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of Whitman, in view of Fowler, and further in view of Ben-Shachar.

Claim 42 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computer, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of Whitman, in view of Fowler, and further in view of Ben-Shachar. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Independent claim 42 is a computer implemented method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A compositing desktop window manager receives application content in reverse z-order to display in a window. The compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. At least a portion of the application content is displayed in a content portion of the window having a frame portion, where the displaying further comprises rendering reflective content on the frame portion based on other discrete content separate from the window in the graphical user interface by the compositing desktop window manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computer, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of

Whitman, in view of Fowler, and further in view of Ben-Shachar, fails to describe or suggest, among other things, *receiving, at a compositing desktop window manager, application content in reverse z-order to display in a window; . . . the compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping*, as recited in independent claim 42. The Office relies upon Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computer, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, in view of Solazzi, in view of Whitman, in view of Fowler, and further in view of Ben-Shachar to render the invention of independent claim 42 unpatentable.

The cited portions of Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computer, Lipton, Lyons and Moki describes a rendering engine using pdf primitives. The cited portions of Solazzi describes reflective properties of 3-D images. The cited portions of Whitman provide term definitions. The cited portion of Fowler describes bump maps for images. The cited portion of Ben-Shachar describes sharing application windows that are processed in reverse z-order to display the windows. Ben-Shachar receives a list that includes window size, shape, position, and sharing information.

Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computer, Lipton, Lyons and Moki fail to describe environmental mappings and receiving application content in reverse z-order. Fowler fails to describe or suggest a windows manager that provides bump mappings and environmental mappings. Moreover, Ben-Schachar fails to describe or suggest a compositing desktop window manager that receives application content in reverse z-order. Nothing in Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computer, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, or Ben-Shachar alone and in combination, describes, or suggests, among other things, receiving application

content in reverse z-order to display in a window and a CDWM for providing transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping.

Unlike Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computer, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, and Ben-Shachar, the invention of independent claim 42 requires, among other things, receiving application content in reverse z-order to display in a window at a compositing desktop window manager that is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computer, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, or Ben-Shachar, alone and in combination, fails to expressly or inherently describe or suggest all elements of the invention of independent claim 42. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 42.

J) Obviousness Rejections Based on Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, and further in view of Donham.

Claims 2 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, and further in view of Donham. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Claims 2 and 22 depend from independent claims 1 and 21. As discussed above, Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki fail to teach or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 2 and 22 are patentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Donham fails to cure the deficiencies of Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple Computers, Lipton, Lyons and Moki with respect to the

elements of independent claims 1 and 22. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claims 2 and 22.

K) Obviousness Rejections Based on Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, and Siracusa, in view of Farrah, and further in view of Meagher.

Claims 20, 40 and 45-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, and Siracusa, in view of Farrah, and further in view of Meagher. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Claims 20 and 40 depend from independent claims 1 and 21. As discussed above, Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki fail to teach or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 20 and 40 are patentable over Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Siracusa, Farrah, and Meagher fails to cure the deficiencies of Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki with respect to the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claims 20 and 40.

Independent claim 45 is a computer-implemented method for resizing a window defined in part by a mesh. The mesh is divided into three regions per mesh dimension. In turn, for each region, maintaining offsets of mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is bounded by a bounding box of the window, and scaling mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is not bounded by the bounding box of the window.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, Siracusa, Farrah, and Meagher fails to describe or suggest, among other things, *dividing the mesh, associated with the window displayed by the computer, into three regions per mesh dimension; for each region, maintaining offsets of mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is bounded by a bounding box of the window, and scaling mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is not bounded by the bounding box of the window*, as recited in independent claim 45. The Office relies upon Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, Siracusa, Farrah, and Meagher to render the invention of independent claim 45 unpatentable.

The cited portions of Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, Siracusa, Farrah, and Meagher describe a rendering engine using pdf-primitives that includes transparent windowing features. The cited portions of Farrah describe generating a grid. The cited portions of Meagher describes generating a 3-D image from a 2-D image. Nothing in Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, Siracusa, Farrah, and Meagher, alone or in combination, describes or suggests, among other things, dividing the mesh into three regions per mesh dimension to maintain mesh offsets for some regions and to scale mesh vertices in other regions.

Unlike Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, Siracusa, Farrah, or Meagher, the invention of independent claim 45 requires, among other things, dividing the mesh, associated with the window displayed by the computer, into three regions per mesh dimension; for each region, maintaining offsets of mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is bounded by a bounding box of the window, and scaling mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is not bounded by the bounding box of the

window. Morgenstern, Portuesi, Erickson, Apple2, Lipton, Lyons and Moki, Siracusa, Farrah, or Meagher, alone or in combination, fail to expressly or inherently teach or suggest all elements of the invention of independent claim 45. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 45.

Dependent claims 46-48 further define novel features of the invention of independent claim 45 and each depend directly from independent claim 45. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 45, dependent claims 46-48 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claims 46-48 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/MONPLAISIR HAMILTON/

Monplaisir Hamilton
Reg. No. 54,851

TLB/JMG/MGH/
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550